



***Environmental
Planning
Commission***

***Agenda Number: 7
Project Number: 1000771
Case #s: 06EPC 01105/01106
September 21, 2006***

Staff Report

<i>Agent</i>	Tierra West, LLC
<i>Applicant</i>	Beazer Homes
<i>Requests</i>	Site Plan for Subdivision Site Plan for Building Permit
<i>Legal Description</i>	Tract C, Cottonwood Pointe
<i>Location</i>	Eagle Ranch Rd. NW (between Irving Blvd. and the Calabacillas Arroyo)
<i>Size</i>	Approximately 7 acres
<i>Existing Zoning</i>	SU-1 for R-2, C-2 and IP Uses
<i>Proposed Zoning</i>	Same

Staff Recommendation

DENIAL of 06EPC 01105, based on the findings beginning on page 15.

DENIAL of 06EPC 01106, based on the findings beginning on page 18.

Staff Planner

Catalina Lehner, AICP-Planner

Summary of Analysis

This request is for a site development plan for subdivision and a site development plan for building permit for Tract C, Cottonwood Pointe, approx. 7 acres. The applicant proposes a gated subdivision of 50 single family homes on individual lots.

The request does not further applicable key policies in the Comprehensive Plan, the West Side Strategic Plan and the Coors Corridor Sector Development Plan. There is some non-compliance with design standards from the governing site plan for subdivision from 2001. There is some neighborhood concern.

Staff recommends denial of the site plan for subdivision and the site plan for building permit based upon the preponderance of policies with which the request conflicts.

City Departments and other interested agencies reviewed this application from 8/7/06 to 8/18/06.
Agency comments used in the preparation of this report begin on Page 23.

AREA CHARACTERISTICS AND ZONING HISTORY

Surrounding zoning, plan designations, and land uses:

	<i>Zoning</i>	<i>Comprehensive Plan Area; Applicable Rank II & III Plans</i>	<i>Land Use</i>
<i>Site</i>	SU-1 for IP, C-2/R-2 uses	Established Urban West Side Strategic Plan Coors Corridor Sector Dev. Plan	Vacant
<i>North</i>	SU-1 for IP, C-2/R-2 uses	Established Urban West Side Strategic Plan Coors Corridor Sector Dev. Plan	Large apartment complex
<i>South</i>	C-2	Established Urban West Side Strategic Plan Coors Corridor Sector Dev. Plan	Vacant, credit union
<i>East</i>	SU-1 for IP, C-2/R-2 uses	Established Urban West Side Strategic Plan Coors Corridor Sector Dev. Plan	Car dealerships
<i>West</i>	SU-1 for a Private School (K-5) & Youth Recreation Center, R-1	Established Urban West Side Strategic Plan Coors Corridor Sector Dev. Plan	School, Single-family homes

Request & Context

This request is for a site development plan for subdivision and a site development plan for building permit for Tract C, Cottonwood Pointe subdivision, approximately 7 acres (the “subject site”). The applicant proposes to construct a gated subdivision of 50 single family homes on individual lots.

The subject site is located between Eagle Ranch Rd. to the east and Irving Blvd. to the west. Across Irving Blvd. is a private school and single family homes. Across Eagle Ranch Rd. is a car dealership. Offices and storage will soon be developed on the land south of the subject site. Further south is a credit union. Abutting the subject site to the north is a large apartment complex. Further north is the Calabacillas Arroyo.

History & Background

The subject site was part of a larger annexation of land in the Paradise Hills area, roughly within the following boundaries: the Calabacillas Arroyo to the north, Paradise Blvd. to the south, Coors Blvd. to the east and Golf Course Rd. to the west (Enactment 116-1983, AX-83-14, Z-83-90). This area

comprised a portion of the Eagle Ranch Master Plan, and was one of four annexations known collectively as “Northwest Mesa-Phase I”, that City Council heard in October 1983. This annexation established SU-1 zoning for a Planned Development Area and included a variety of uses, called out as commercial (C-2 and C-1), light industrial, office and residential (R-2 and R-1). The tracts in this area received a combination of these zoning designations based upon the intent for development at that time.

In January 2001, the EPC approved a site plan for building permit for the apartment complex to the north (01128-01200). Also approved was a site development plan for subdivision (01128-01199) for a 38-acre site, which included the apartment site and the subject site. The site plan for subdivision replatted a portion of the former Adobe Wells subdivision to create Tracts A, B and C of Cottonwood Pointe (Tract A is now known as Tract D). In September 2001, the EPC approved a request for a site plan for building permit for an 88-unit condominium complex (01128-01081) and a site plan for subdivision (01128-01080) that divided the subject site into two tracts. The subject site was not subdivided and the condominiums were not built.

Design Standards

Design standards provide guidance to ensure that a proposed development 1) will be of high quality that exceeds minimum Zoning Code requirements, and 2) will further the intent of applicable City Plans and policies and help make planning goals a reality. Design standards applicable to this proposal are found in the West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP), the Coors Corridor Sector Development Plan (CCSDP) and in a site plan for subdivision approved in January 2001 (01128-01199).

Definitions (Zoning Code §14-16-1-5)

Site Development Plan for Subdivision: An accurate plan at a scale of at least 1 inch to 100 feet which covers at least one lot and specifies the site, proposed use, pedestrian and vehicular ingress and egress, any internal circulation requirements and, for each lot, maximum building height, minimum building setback, and maximum total dwelling units and/or nonresidential uses’ maximum floor area ratio.

Zoning

The subject site is zoned SU-1 for R-2, C-2 and IP Uses. The R-2 zone (§14-16-2-11) “provides suitable sites for houses, townhouses and medium density apartments, and uses incidental thereto in the Established and Central Urban area.” R-2 permissive uses include “uses permissive in the R-T zone”, and R-T permissive uses include “uses permissive in the R-1 zone.” A permissive use in the R-1 zone is “house, one per lot.” Therefore, the proposed single-family homes are allowed under the current zoning. However, just because they are allowed does not mean that single-family homes are what was envisioned when the zoning was established or that they are the most appropriate use for the subject site. Irving Blvd. serves as a de-facto boundary between single-family homes to the west and mixed commercial/industrial uses to the east.

The C-2 Community Commercial zone “provides suitable sites for offices, for most service and commercial activities, and for certain specified institutional uses.” The IP Industrial Park zone “provides suitable sites for a wide range of industrial and commercial uses, provided such uses are conducted in a

compatible and harmonious manner...”. The SU-1 for R-2, C-2 and IP Uses zoning permissively allows residential, commercial and industrial uses on the subject site.

Long Range Roadway System

The Long Range Roadway System (LRRS) map, produced by the Mid-Region Council of Governments (MRCOG), identifies the functional classifications of roadways. Irving Blvd. is a minor arterial at this location, with a 106-foot right-of-way. The typical right-of-way for a minor arterial is 86 ft. Eagle Ranch Rd., at this location, is a collector with an 86-foot right-of-way. The typical right-of-way for a collector is 68 ft. Both roadways are wider than usual given their individual classifications.

Public Facilities/Community Services

Transit: Albuquerque Ride route #94-Unser Express, serves the subject site. Coors Blvd., within walking distance of the subject site, is designed by the Comprehensive Plan as an Enhanced Transit Corridor. The #96 Crosstown Commuter, #156 West Side Rapid Ride, and #155 Coors pass within walking distance of the subject site.

Police: The Shawn McWethy Substation, at 6404 Los Volcanes NW, provides police coverage.

Fire: A fire station is located on Ellison Drive, about 1.5 miles north of the subject site.

APS: Petroglyph Elementary School, James Monroe Middle School, and Cibola High School

ANALYSIS -CONFORMANCE TO ADOPTED PLANS AND POLICIES

1) Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan- Rank I

The subject site is located in an area that the Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan has designated Established Urban. The Comprehensive Plan goal of Developing and Established Urban Areas is “to create a quality urban environment which perpetuates the tradition of identifiable, individual but integrated communities within the metropolitan area and which offers variety and maximum choice in housing, transportation, work areas and life styles, while creating a visually pleasing built environment.” Applicable policies include:

Land Use Policies-

Policy II.B.5a: The Developing Urban and Established Urban areas as shown by the Plan map shall allow a full range of urban land uses, resulting in an overall gross density up to 5 dwelling units per acre.

Policy II.B.5d: The location, intensity and design of new development shall respect existing neighborhood values, natural environmental conditions and carrying capacities, scenic resources, and resources of other social, cultural, recreational concern.

Policy II.B.5e: New growth shall be accommodated through development in areas where vacant land is contiguous to existing or programmed urban facilities and services and where the integrity of existing neighborhoods can be ensured.

Policy II.B.5f: Clustering of homes to provide larger shared open areas and houses oriented towards pedestrian or bikeways shall be encouraged.

Policy II.B.5h: Higher density housing is most appropriate in the following situations:

- In designated Activity Centers.
- In areas with excellent access to the major street network.
- *In areas where a mixed density pattern is already established by zoning or use* (emphasis mine), where it is compatible with existing area land uses and where adequate infrastructure is or will be available.
- In areas now predominantly zoned single-family only where it comprises a complete block face and faces onto similar or higher density development; up to 10 dwelling units per net acre.
- In areas where a transition is needed between single-family homes and much more intensive development: densities will vary up to 30 dwelling units per net acre according to the intensity of development in adjacent areas.

Policy II.B.5k: Land adjacent to arterial streets shall be planned to minimize harmful effects of traffic; livability and safety of established residential neighborhoods shall be protected in transportation planning and operations.

Policy II.B.5l: Quality and innovation in design shall be encouraged in all new development; design shall be encouraged which is appropriate to the plan area.

Environmental Protection & Heritage Conservation-Noise

Goal: To protect the public health and welfare and enhance the quality of life by reducing noise and by preventing new land use/noise conflicts.

Policy II.C.4.a: Noise considerations shall be integrated into the planning process so that future noise/land use conflicts are prevented.

Technique 6: Include noise mitigation measures for all noise sensitive and residential uses adjacent to current or proposed arterial streets.

Community Resource Management-Transportation and Transit

Goal: To develop corridors, both streets and adjacent land uses, that provide a balanced circulation system through efficient placement of employment and services, and encouragement of bicycling, walking, and use of transit/paratransit as alternatives to automobile travel, while providing sufficient roadway capacity to meet mobility and access needs.

Policy II.D.4g: Pedestrian opportunities shall be promoted and integrated into development to create safe and pleasant non-motorized travel conditions.

The proposed development will be located in an area characterized by land use variety. Single-family homes, a school, apartments and various commercial uses are nearby. Adding more single-family homes to the area will not increase land use variety or provide additional services, so the request does not further Policy II.B.5a-full range of urban land uses. However, the request does further Policy II.B.5e-programmed facilities/neighborhood integrity, because its use of existing urban services is unlikely to disrupt neighborhood integrity.

The request does not further Policy II.B.5d-neighborhood values/natural environmental conditions, which the location, design and intensity of new development must respect. There is neighborhood concern about the location of the proposed use, and low intensity housing does not respect the intent of the existing zoning. The agent has indicated that the proposed subdivision will be gated. A gated subdivision does not respect social and recreational concerns and creates a culture of isolation that does not interact with the surrounding community. Also, the proposed homes are not clustered or oriented toward pedestrian or bikeways as Policy II.B.5f-clustering of homes, calls for. The open space provided is not as usable as it could be. Therefore, the request does not further Policy II.B.5f. The request partially furthers Policy II.B.5l-design quality/innovation, which calls for new development to be of a quality design appropriate to the Plan area. The design is appropriate for the Plan area and some features add quality, but a “garagescape” design cannot be considered innovative.

Policy 5h states that higher density housing is most appropriate “where a mixed density pattern is already established by zoning or use”. The large apartment complex to the north establishes a pattern in which higher density housing, as opposed to a single-family gated subdivision, would be most appropriate. The proposed development does not further the intent of Policy II.B.5h-higher density housing. Nor does the proposal further the Economic Development Goal. Adding another residential use will preclude other job-creating uses that could improve the jobs/housing balance on the Westside.

This proposal does not further Policy II.B.5k-land adjacent to arterial streets, because such land must be planned to minimize traffic’s harmful effects. The proposed single-family homes would be located between two busy arterial streets with fast traffic, and would rely upon one entry point. A single access from Eagle Ranch Rd. could prove frustrating to residents. For safety reasons, two access points would be beneficial.

The proposal does not further the Noise Goal because a new land use/noise conflict is likely to arise, and the proposed development’s gated nature cannot prevent it. Policy II.C.4a-noise considerations, is also not furthered because noise mitigation is not addressed. Technique 6 states that noise mitigation measures need to be included for residential uses adjacent to arterial streets. The proposed office/storage development to the south (Project #1004820) could adversely affect residents of the proposed subdivision.

The proposal does not further the Transportation and Transit Goal because it does not encourage bicycling, walking and Transit use and, in fact, discourages them. Pedestrians cannot access Irving Blvd. and are forced to walk through the subdivision to the one access point on Eagle Ranch Rd. The proposal also does not further Policy II.D.4g. Pedestrian opportunities have not been integrated into this development and definitely are not being promoted by this proposal.

Water Conservation/Green Principles

Individual rain barrels would be the homeowner's option. Staff suggests that the HOA allow rain barrels should they be desired and encourage homeowners to install additional xeric landscape to the sparsely landscaped yards. To Staff's knowledge, no green principles will be implemented in the homes' construction.

2) West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP)- Rank II

The West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP) was first adopted in 1997 and recently amended in 2002 to help promote development of Neighborhood and Community Activity Centers. The WSSP identifies 13 communities, each with a unique identity and comprised of smaller neighborhood clusters. The subject site is located in the Paradise Community, which consists of the area between: the Calabacillas Arroyo to the north, the Town of Alameda grant line to the south, Universe Blvd. to the west and a small area east of Coors Blvd. to the east. Policies particular to the Paradise Community mostly address development of the Regional Center near Cottonwood Mall and the Calabacillas Arroyo. Applicable policies include:

Policy 1.1: Thirteen distinct communities, as shown on the Community Plan Map and described individually in this Plan, shall constitute the existing and future urban form of the West Side. Communities shall develop with areas of higher density (in Community and Neighborhood Centers), surrounded by areas of lower density. Bernalillo County and the City of Albuquerque Planning Commissions shall require that high density and non-residential development occur within Community and Neighborhood Centers. Low density residential development (typical 3-5 du/acre subdivisions, or large lot rural subdivisions) shall not be approved within the Centers.

Policy 2.5: When considering approval of subdivisions or site development plans for residential development or zone changes to residential or higher density residential, the City Planning Department shall consider whether local public schools have sufficient capacity to support the increased number of homes.

Policy 3.8: The largest mix of land uses and the highest density shall develop in the Community and Neighborhood Centers. Multifamily housing, public facilities, educational and employment facilities, and other non-single family residential uses are appropriate along with commercial services in these areas.

Policy 4.6: The following design guidelines (p. 160-171) shall become policies with the approval of this Plan: View Preservation; Views East of Coors Boulevard; Views to and from the Monument; Other Views; Height; Lighting; Vegetation; Overhead Utilities; Radio, TV, and Cellular Towers; Signs; *Fences and Walls (emphasis mine)*; and Additional Design Guideline Issues. It is recognized that additional Design Guidelines based on these and other applicable policies of the Plan shall be developed as follow-up work, and will be more complete than those included here. *These policies were considered too critical to wait for additional planning efforts in the future (emphasis mine).*

The WSSP provides design guidelines for residential development (p. 171) that include:

- Subdivisions shall be designed to provide an efficient circulation pattern for transit service. Direct routes through developments, separated from congested parking lots, are necessary to provide convenient service to residents.
- Walking distances within subdivisions to arterials, collectors, or streets with proposed transit service should be kept to 750 feet whenever possible. Developments enclosed by walls and fences, or land locked areas (i.e., cul-de-sacs) need to provide openings so that pedestrians and bicyclists are provided direct access to transit service.
- Locate high-density residential developments at Community or Neighborhood Centers. Residential densities should be zoned so that they increase toward transit routes or facilities.

Policy 4.10: It is important to promote and establish land uses and urban patterns whose design support bicycle and pedestrian travel, public transportation, encourage ridership, enhance public mobility, and promote alternatives to single occupant vehicle use.

WSSP Policy 1.1 requires that Westside communities develop with higher density and non-residential development in designated Community and Neighborhood Centers, surrounded by areas of less intense development. The subject site is located north of the Paseo del Norte/Coors Community Center (p. 131) and not within it. It is appropriate that lower density (3-5 du/acre) residential development occur outside such centers, so the request further WSSP Policy 1.1 (the proposed development is medium-density, 7 du/ac). Similarly, the request further WSSP Policy 3.8, which states that non-single family uses are appropriate in Community and Neighborhood centers. Therefore, single-family uses are appropriate outside of such centers.

The proposal does not further WSSP Policy 2.5, which states that that the City shall consider public school capacity when reviewing proposed site plans for new residential development. There is nothing to prevent families with children from purchasing a home in the proposed subdivision; 50 homes are proposed. The high school and middle school are over capacity, and the elementary school is near capacity. In addition, the proposed site design does not establish a land use that enhances public mobility and therefore does not further WSSP Policy 4.10, which aims to promote alternatives to single-occupant vehicle use. Rather, by not providing connections to Irving Blvd., the proposed subdivision hinders public mobility and discourages alternatives to single-occupancy vehicles.

WSSP Policy 4.6 states that the design guidelines on p. 160-171 became policies with WSSP adoption because they are critical. The proposal does not further WSSP Policy 4.6 because the site layout does not conform to the design policies with respect to Fences and Walls and Transit Access. The WSSP indicates that gated communities are “strongly discouraged on the West side”

(p. 169). Such enclaves do not relate to the surrounding community and restrict people's access to nearby commercial areas and transit lines. For similar reasons, the proposal does not conform to the design policies for residential development (p. 171), which require that subdivision design provide an efficient circulation pattern for transit and that walled developments provide openings so that people have short walking distances to transit (p. 170). No wall openings are proposed.

3) Coors Corridor Sector Development Plan (CCSDP)-Rank III:

The subject site lies within the boundaries of the Coors Corridor Sector Development Plan (CCSDP), a Rank III plan adopted in 1984 and amended in 1989, 1995 and 2003. The Coors Corridor extends northward from Central Avenue to NM 528 (Corrales Road). The CCSDP divides the Coors Corridor into four segments; the eastern portion of the subject site, adjacent to Eagle Ranch Rd., is located in Segment 3 (Western Trail to Calabacillas Arroyo) and lies within a view preservation area (see p. 103). The CCSDP contains policies and design standards for development, with the overarching goal to “promote visual harmony between new and existing buildings and between the built environment and the natural scene” (p. 82). The following CCSDP policies apply:

Policy 3.7-Cluster Design: Cluster design for development of residential, commercial, and industrial structures shall be encouraged. (p. 80)

Policy 4.a.3-New Development: New development in the Coors Corridor should be designed to be compatible with the natural landscape and the built environment in accordance with the design regulations and guidelines. (p. 86)

Policy 4.b.2-Building setback, height and bulk: Buildings should be located and designed to provide a pleasing and functional relationship to the roadway, the site, and to adjacent or related buildings and structures. (p. 88)

Policy 4.b.4.B.1-Site Landscaping Regulation: Street trees shall be planted in accordance with existing regulations. (p. 93)

Policy 4.b.7-Access: Separate pedestrian and vehicular access should be provided. Pedestrian access to structures shall not utilize driveways as walkways. Pedestrian connections between uses in commercial developments shall be emphasized.

Policy 4.b.10-Architectural Design: Architectural design should contribute to the enhancement of the overall visual environment of the Coors Corridor. (p. 99)

Policy 3.5-Development Intensity: Intensity of development shall be compatible with the roadway function, existing zoning or recommended land use, environmental concerns, and design guidelines. (p.79)

The overarching purpose of the CCSDP's design standards is to guide development in the Coors Corridor and ensure that such development helps achieve a balance between the built and natural environments. Overall, the proposed development does not contribute to this purpose.

Policy 4.a.3-New Development, is partially furthered. The proposed designs and color schemes are compatible with the existing built environment in the area, but the sparse landscaping contrasts to the mature and relatively abundant landscape in the area. Policy 4.b.10-Architectural Design is not furthered. A large garage door dominates each design and monotonous perimeter walls do not enhance the visual environment. Policy 4.b.4.B.1-Site Landscaping Regulation, is not furthered because street trees are not even proposed.

The proposal does not further Policy 3.7-Cluster Design, because the site layout is uniform and is not clustered in any way. Nor does the proposal further Policy 4.b.2-Building setback, height and bulk, which calls for buildings to have a "pleasing and functional relationship to the roadway". Because the proposed development is gated and walled, there is no relationship with the roadway and no functional relationship with the surrounding community. Policy 4.b.7-Access, is not furthered. Pedestrian and vehicular access is not separate, and no pedestrian connections from the cul-de-sacs are proposed.

The proposal does not further Policy 3.5-Development Intensity. The proposed development, between two roadways, is incompatible with roadway function. Eagle Ranch Rd. (a collector in this location) and Irving Blvd. (a minor arterial) have right-of-ways larger than usual for their classification, indicating they were built to serve higher intensity residential or commercial uses. Also, the intensity of the proposed development is incompatible with existing zoning, which allows R-2, C-2 and IP uses. R-1 is a lower-intensity use than intended by the subject site's zoning.

ANALYSIS--SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR SUBDIVISION & SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR BUILDING PERMIT

SITE PLAN FOR SUBDIVISION

The purpose of the proposed site plan for subdivision is to subdivide the subject site into 50 individual lots. Design standards are not included. A 2001 site plan for subdivision with design standards applies to the subject site (01128-01199). The extent to which the proposed development complies with it is discussed below, as applicable.

The R-2 zone (Zoning Code §14-16-2-11) references the R-T zone (§14-16-2-9) regarding lot size. The minimum lot size allowed in the R-T zone, for a house, is 3,600 sf. Minimum lot width is 36 ft. Staff finds that Lot 22 measures \approx 3,404 sf. Lots 9-13 and Lots 38-50 measure \approx 3,515 sf. These lots do not comply with R-2 regulations regarding minimum lot size, but the SU-1 zoning leaves this determination to the EPC. (The subject site is zoned SU-1 for R-2, C-2 and IP Uses). Staff recommends that at least the 3,404 sf lot be enlarged to 3,600 sf., and that the lost open space be recuperated by providing centrally located open space on Lot 23 (see Open Space section).

SITE PLAN FOR BUILDING PERMIT

Site Plan Layout / Configuration

The proposed site layout is a walled enclave of 50 single-family dwelling units at a density of ≈ 7.39 DUs/acre. The lots are arranged around, and in between, two internal cul-de-sacs. Most lots are $\approx 3,610$ sf. A few are smaller (as noted above) and a few near the edges are much larger. There is one entrance from Eagle Ranch Rd. to access the two private internal streets, which run parallel and do not connect.

Refuse Enclosure: The proposed homes will have individual residential carts. The Solid Waste Management Division (SWMD) has commented that the carts should have a storage area and not be visible from street, or be located inside garages.

Walls/Fences

The proposed development is defined by the extensive use of walls. A 5-6 ft. screen wall surrounds the development on all sides except Irving Blvd. Along Irving Blvd., the proposed 605 ft. of wall will vary from 6 to 16 ft tall. Though this is likely due to the grade, Staff believes that a note should be added to the site plan explaining that the wall will be a constant ≈ 6 ft. from the finished floor elevation of the homes. Without such a note, it may appear that a 16 ft. high wall is intended.

Another screen wall runs along Eagle Ranch Rd. and separates the retaining wall from the sidewalk. The retaining and screen walls will be CMU split face tan block. Each lot will be separated from adjoining lots by 5 ft. unfinished CMU privacy walls. Because the privacy walls are so widely used and will be visible, Staff suggests that they be finished in an earthtone color.

The wall design complies with Zoning Code §14-16-3-19, as required in the 2001 site plan for subdivision. Regardless, Staff finds that the long expanses of walls along Irving Blvd. (605 ft.) and Eagle Ranch Rd. (265 ft.) create monotony and do little to improve the quality of the visual environment so often referred to in the CCSDP. An additional wall treatment would mitigate these concerns and is warranted, even more so because the subject site is zoned SU-1. Staff recommends that the pilasters and the cap be finished in a different color than the main wall. A 2 in. cap and pilasters the same color as the main wall are barely visible.

Vehicular Access, Circulation & Parking

The proposed development's only access point, on Eagle Ranch Rd., serves vehicles. Due to the site layout, circulation is limited to driving up and down the private internal streets. Because they end in cul-de-sacs, there is no circulation between the streets within the development. Parking will be in individual driveways or on the internal streets, which the proposed roll-up curb will facilitate.

The 2001 site plan for subdivision specifies that vehicular access was to be developed across from the existing Westside Dr. that provides secondary access to Tracts A and B and secondary access to the subject site (Tract C). The proposed access point complies and provides access to Tract B, though Tract A is only reachable by driving through Tract B.

A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was not required.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Access and Circulation, Transit Access

Pedestrian & Bicycle Access & Circulation: Access and internal circulation is poor for both bicyclists and pedestrians. Because there is only one access point (on Eagle Ranch Rd.) and it caters to vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists are forced to go around the subject site to access Irving Blvd.-which is illogical since Irving Blvd. provides direct access to Coors Blvd. Once inside the proposed development, pedestrian and bicycle circulation is equally poor and limited to going up-and-down the internal streets. Walking and biking from the westernmost lots is particularly discouraging because they are far from the one entrance.

Precluding pedestrian and bicycle opportunities is contrary to the Comprehensive Plan's Transportation and Transit goals and policies, and WSSP policies 4.6 and 4.10. The Department of Municipal Development, the Transit Department and Staff feel strongly that providing a pedestrian connection at the end of each cul-de-sac will help mitigate the poor pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation. The connections are needed for the proposed development to comply with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan, the WSSP and the CCSDP and applicable policies contained therein. The proposed site plan does not comply with the 2001 design standards, which show a 6 ft. pedestrian path between Tract B (the apartments) and Tract C (the subject site).

Transit Access: Transit access is correlated to pedestrian and bicycle access; transit does not function effectively if riders cannot get to transit stops. The #94 Unser Express passes the subject site on Eagle Ranch Rd. The stops are near the apartment complex to the north. The #96 Crosstown Commuter, #156 West Side Rapid Ride, and #155 Coors pass on Coors Blvd., within walking distance of the subject site. Without pedestrian entrances on Irving Blvd., however, the distance to Coors. Blvd. will likely be too far for walking from the westernmost lots—which is how the site layout impedes transit access.

Lighting & Security

Lighting: Seven light poles are proposed. Each has one cut-off fixture and is 18 ft. tall. The lighting detail depicts height from the top of the pole to the top of its concrete support structure, but needs to be revised to show height from top to grade as is customary.

Zoning Code §14-16-3-9(F), Area Lighting Regulations. Section F states that maximum light pole height, within 100 ft. of a residential zone, is 16 feet. The 2001 design standards reiterate this requirement. Both refer to street lights. If this subdivision is gated and the streets are private, the light poles can measure 18 ft.. However, if the streets are public, the light poles must measure 16 ft. *measured from the finished grade to the top of the pole.*”

Landscaping Plan

Scope: Landscaping is proposed in the 0.23 acre common area, a common area near the entrance, and along a narrow planting strip parallel to each internal street. The HOA will maintain this landscaping. Front yard landscaping is also shown, and will be the property owner's responsibility. The landscape layout or the types of plants proposed for the smaller common area are not shown; they need to be

specified on the landscape plan. The larger common area includes a grey gravel pathway and one bench. Santa Fe brown gravel is proposed as top dressing.

A variety of trees, shrubs and grasses are proposed. Trees include Sycamore and Austrian Pine. Shrubs are Desert Willow (common area), Butterfly Bush and Mugo Pine (front yards). Staff suggests replacing the proposed Sycamore, which is highly allergenic, with a tree such as Purple Robe Locust. The Austrian Pine, a fairly high water user, should be replaced with the hardy and fast-growing Afghan Pine. The caliper of the pine tree needs to be indicated, not the height.

Other plants proposed for the common area are Rosemary, lavender, autumn sage, Chamisa, Regal Mist, Hawthorne and Potentilla. Staff suggests that additional landscaping be added to the 0.23 acre common area near the sidewalk, where landscaping is sparse. Vitex and Apache Plume would be good choices. Staff also suggests the addition of two hardy and attractive Bird of Paradise shrubs at the end the cul-de-sacs, which are devoid of landscaping. The proposed landscaping along the internal streets is monotonous; it consists of Rosemary, Regal Mist and Threadgrass, *repeated 29 times*. Staff suggests that a different combination of plants be used for every other planting cluster to add some variety. Plants such as Hawthorne, Apache Plume and Autumn Sage would be appropriate.

Front yard landscaping includes Austrian Pine, Mugo Pine, Desert Willow, Butterfly Bush, Hesperaloe, Rosemary and an unspecified wildflower (which Staff suggests is specified as Perky Sue, Sundrops or Globemallow-which all require very little water). Staff recommends that Butterfly Bush be used in the common area and that Russian Sage, which requires less care and water, be placed in the yards.

Requirements: Zoning Code §14-16-3-10, Landscaping Regulations Applicable to Apartment and Non-Residential Development, does not apply to the proposed residential development. However, the Street Tree Ordinance does apply (see Chapter 6, Article 6, R.O. 1974) and states: "All applicants for building permits for construction of a new building or building addition of over 200 sf shall submit a street tree plan for those parts of the lot adjacent to a major street, a major local street, or another street where street trees are required." (Section 6-6-2-4(A)). In addition, the 2001 design standards state that the street trees along Irving Blvd. shall be located 25 ft. on center.

The City Forrester comments that street trees should be placed outside the wall along Irving Blvd. and Eagle Ranch Rd.. He also wonders why no trees are proposed along the internal roads when there is a continuous planting strip. Staff believes this is because trees could impair sight lines when people back out of their driveways. Regarding the required street trees, Staff recommends that the applicant comply with this City ordinance and install street trees along both Irving Blvd. and Eagle Ranch Rd. In consultation with the City Forrester, Staff suggests Escarpment Live Oak along Irving Blvd. and Chinese Pistache along Eagle Ranch Rd. Staff recommends that the applicant contact the City Forrester regarding tree spacing and the appropriate size of planting wells.

Grading & Drainage Plan

The subject site has a significant slope. It generally slopes downward from west to east, and from north to south beginning roughly on the upper third of the site. Elevations range from $\approx 5,120$ ft. to $\approx 5,065$

feet, for a grade change of 55 ft. Most water flows east toward Eagle Ranch Rd., where it flows into the storm drain system and is discharged into the Calabacillas Arroyo.

Utility Plan

The proposed sewer lines will run along each internal street and end in the cul-de-sacs. The proposed water lines, serving each internal street, connect to existing water lines along Irving Blvd. A fire hydrant is proposed near the vehicle entrance.

Architecture & Design

The proposed single-family homes are all two-story with prominent garages and porticos that lead to deeply recessed front doors. The homes include architectural details above the windows, the entryways and the garage doors. Three model types and six color schemes are available, for a total of 18 different possibilities (see elevations). Main stucco colors include tan, off-white, light green, white and dark tan. The off-white and light green are not depicted on the color elevations. Accent colors are the same except that dark tan is excluded. The accent features and the color variety are helpful, but do not change the fact that the garages overpower the homes, dominate the view from the internal streets and perpetuate the culture of isolation exacerbated by the gate. The garages are $\approx 52\%$ of the bottom story of each home.

Short of a re-design of the residential product, Staff believes that mitigation of the garagescape feel can be achieved by increasing the proposed development's quality. This can be done by providing additional landscaping, meeting minimum R-2 lot size requirements and complying with the WSSP intent of not perpetuating gated subdivisions.

Signage

No signage is shown on the site plan or the perimeter wall. A note needs to be added to the site plan stating that no signage is proposed. The 2001 design standards address signage. The only free-standing signage allowed are monument signs that are integrated with building colors and materials.

Public Outdoor Space

Public outdoor space is not required pursuant to Zoning Code §14-16-3-18 (B)(4), General Building and Site Design Regulation for Non-Residential Uses. However, private outdoor "common areas" are often provided in subdivisions for the residents' benefit and use. In this case, common areas are needed to help mitigate the isolation created by the garagescapes and the gate, which does not comply with the intent of the WSSP.

A small common area (8,620 sf) is proposed near the entrance and a larger 0.236 acre common area is provided along the southern internal street. No details are provided regarding the small common area. The larger common area is an awkward triangle shape. It is a "remnant" area that cannot be used for lots and was therefore made into a "common area". Both are not as usable as they could be.

The 0.236 acre common area is readily accessible only to residents along the southern internal street. Residents near the northern cul-de-sac have a long walk to access it. To make the larger open space more functional and centrally located, Staff recommends enlarging Lot 22 (so it is the R-2 minimum lot

size of 3,600 sf), and that Lot 23 is converted to open space at this centralized location. A small portion (i.e.-10 ft. x 10 ft.) of the larger open space should be turf, so that it functions more like a private park where residents can gather and children can play, as opposed to the non-functional landscape corridor that is proposed. A picnic table or benches nearby would help further this idea.

Concerns of Reviewing Agencies/Pre-Hearing Discussion

City departments and other interested agencies reviewed this application from 8/7/06 to 8/18/06. The applicant did not attend a voluntary pre-application review meeting but was present for the pre-hearing discussion meeting on August 23, 2006. Staff met with the applicant on August 21, 2006 to discuss the request.

The Department of Municipal Development and the Transit Department have commented regarding the lack of pedestrian connections to Irving Blvd. (see Pedestrian and Bicycle Access section). The City Forrester commented regarding the lack of street trees (see Landscape section).

Neighborhood Concerns

The affected neighborhood organization is the Paradise Hills Civic Association (PHCA), which the applicant notified. The Office of Neighborhood Coordination (ONC) recommended this case for facilitation, though the PHCA declined the meeting.

The New Vistas Home Owners Association (NVHOA), which represents homeowners in the subdivision across Irving Blvd., has expressed some concern. They feel that the location is better suited to apartments or townhouses than single-family homes. They point out that there are no single-family homes east of Irving Blvd., which is a commercial/industrial area, and the site is sandwiched between two busy, noisy streets. However, should the project be approved, the NVHOA supports improvements to the wall along Irving Blvd., street trees, pedestrian openings leading to Irving Blvd., and landscape and open space improvements within the subdivision.

Conclusions

This proposal is for a site development plan for subdivision and a site development plan for building permit for an approximately 7 acre site between Irving Blvd. and Eagle Ranch Rd. The proposed subdivision would consist of 50 two-story, single-family homes with one gated access point. Staff finds that the proposal does not further applicable key policies in the Comprehensive Plan, the West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP) and the Coors Corridor Sector Development Plan (CCSDP). Lack of compliance with policies regarding transportation and transit, pedestrian circulation and landscape is most significant. Staff has compared the proposed site plan for building permit with the 2001 design standards, as applicable, and has found a couple of instances of non-compliance.

Because of the preponderance of policies in the Comprehensive Plan, the WSSP and the CCSDP that the proposal does not further, the fact that the single-family homes would be located between high-density apartments and an office/storage use, and the potential for negative impacts upon future residents, Staff recommends denial of the site plan for subdivision and the site plan for building permit.

FINDINGS -06EPC 01105, September 21, 2006-Site Development Plan for Subdivision

1. This is a request for approval of a site development plan for subdivision for Tract C, Cottonwood Pointe, an approximately 7 acre site located between Irving Blvd. and Eagle Ranch Rd., zoned SU-1 for R-2, C-2 and IP uses.
2. This request proposes subdividing Tract C to create approximately 50 lots for single-family homes. A proposed site plan for building permit for the homes (06EPC 01106) is associated with this request.
3. The minimum lot size in the R-2 zone is 3,600 sf for a lot with a single home. Lot 22, Lots 9-13 and Lots 38-50 measure less than 3,600 sf. Because of the subject site's SU-1 zoning, these lot sizes are allowable even though they are less than minimum size.
4. The subject site lies within the boundaries of the West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP) and the Coors Corridor Sector Development Plan (CCSDP).
5. The proposal *does not further* the intent of the following Comprehensive Plan policies:
 - A. Policy II.B.5a-Full range of urban land uses. The use would not increase land use variety or provide additional services in the area.
 - B. Policy II.B.5d-Neighborhood values/natural environmental conditions. A gated subdivision does not respect social and recreational concerns and creates a culture of isolation that does not interact with the surrounding community. Neighbors are concerned that single-family homes are not an appropriate use for this location.
 - C. Policy II.B.5f-Clustering of homes. The homes are not clustered to allow and shared open areas, which result from such clustering, are not provided.
 - D. Policy II.B.5h-Higher density housing. The adjacent apartment complex establishes a use pattern in which higher density housing, as opposed to single-family homes, would be appropriate.
 - E. Policy II.B.5k-Land adjacent to arterial streets. The single-family homes would be located between two busy roadways and rely upon one entry point.
 - F. Noise Goal. A new land use/noise conflict is likely to arise.

- G. Policy II.C.4a-Noise considerations. The proposal does not address noise mitigation measures.
 - H. Transportation & Transit Goal. The proposed gated subdivision does not encourage bicycling, walking and transit use.
 - I. Policy II.D.4g-Pedestrian Opportunities. Pedestrian opportunities have not been included in this development and are not being promoted.
6. The proposal *further*s and *partially further*s the intent of the following Comprehensive Plan policies:
- A. Policy II.B.5e-Programmed facilities/neighborhood integrity (further)s. The use of existing services is unlikely to compromise neighborhood integrity.
 - B. Policy II.B.5l-Design quality/innovation (partially further)s. The design is appropriate for the Plan area and some features add quality, but a “garagescape” design cannot be considered innovative.
7. With respect to the West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP), the proposal *does not further* the following policies:
- A. WSSP Policy 4.10-The proposed site design hinders public mobility and discourages alternatives to single-occupancy vehicles.
 - B. WSSP Policy 4.6- the proposed site layout does not conform to the design policies with respect to Fences and Walls and Transit Access.
 - C. Design policies for residential development -The proposed subdivision does not provide wall openings so people can walk to transit stops.
 - D. WSSP Policy 2.5-There is nothing to prevent families with children from purchasing a home in the proposed subdivision. The high school and middle school are over capacity, and the elementary school is near capacity.
8. With respect to the WSSP, the proposal *further*s the following policies:
- A. WSSP Policy 1.1-The subject site is located north of the Paseo del Norte/Coors Community Center. It is appropriate that lower density (3-5 du/acre) residential development occur outside such centers.
 - B. WSSP Policy 3.8-Single-family uses are appropriate outside of Community and Neighborhood centers.

9. Regarding the Coors Corridor Sector Development Plan (CCSDP), the proposal *does not further* the following policies:

- A. Policy 4.b.10-Architectural Design. A large garage door dominates each design and monotonous perimeter walls do not enhance the visual environment.
- B. Policy 4.b.4.B.1-Site Landscaping Regulation. Street trees are not proposed.
- C. Policy 3.7-Cluster Design. The site layout is uniform and is not clustered in any way.
- D. Policy 4.b.2-Building setback, height and bulk. The proposed development is gated and walled, so there is no functional relationship with the roadway or the surrounding community.
- E. Policy 4.b.7-Access. Pedestrian and vehicular access is not separate, and no pedestrian connections from the cul-de-sacs are proposed.
- F. Policy 3.5-Development Intensity. The proposed development is incompatible with roadway function and its intensity is incompatible with existing zoning.

10. The proposal *partially furthers* CCSDP Policy 4.a.3-New Development. The proposed design and colors are compatible with the surrounding built environment, but the landscape is sparse compared to nearby landscaping.

11. Gated subdivisions, which are “strongly discouraged on the West side” (WSSP p.169), do not relate to the surrounding community and restrict people’s access to nearby commercial areas and transit lines.

12. Mitigation of the garagescape feel can be achieved by increasing the proposed development’s quality by providing additional landscaping, meeting minimum R-2 lot size requirements and not perpetuating gated subdivisions.

13. Poor access and internal circulation adversely affect bicyclists and pedestrians, and decrease the likelihood that residents will use Transit. The access point on Eagle Ranch Rd. caters to vehicles.

14. Nothing prevents families with children from purchasing a home in the proposed subdivision. Albuquerque Public Schools (APS) reports that schools in the area are at and nearing capacity.

15. A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was not required.

16. The New Vistas Home Owners Association (NVHOA) believes that the location is better suited to apartments or townhouses. However, the NVHOA would support improvements to the wall along Irving Blvd., street trees, pedestrian openings, and landscape and open space improvements.

RECOMMENDATION - 06EPC 01105, September 21, 2006

DENIAL of 06EPC 01105, a Site Development Plan for Subdivision for Tract C, Cottonwood Pointe, based on the preceding Findings.

FINDINGS -06EPC 01106, September 21, 2006-Site Development Plan for Building Permit

1. This is a request for approval of a site development plan for subdivision for Tract C, Cottonwood Pointe, and an approximately 7 acre site located between Irving Blvd. and Eagle Ranch Rd., zoned SU-1 for R-2, C-2 and IP uses.
2. The applicant proposes to construct approximately 50 single-family homes on individual lots. A proposed site plan for subdivision to create the lots is associated with this request (06EPC-1105).
3. The subject site lies within the boundaries of the West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP) and the Coors Corridor Sector Development Plan (CCSDP).
4. The proposal *does not further* the intent of the following Comprehensive Plan policies:
 - A. Policy II.B.5a-Full range of urban land uses. The use would not increase land use variety or provide additional services in the area.
 - B. Policy II.B.5d-Neighborhood values/natural environmental conditions. A gated subdivision does not respect social and recreational concerns and creates a culture of isolation that does not interact with the surrounding community. Neighbors are concerned that single-family homes are not an appropriate use for this location.
 - C. Policy II.B.5f-Clustering of homes. The homes are not clustered to allow and shared open areas, which result from such clustering, are not provided.
 - D. Policy II.B.5h-Higher density housing. The adjacent apartment complex establishes a use pattern in which higher density housing, as opposed to single-family homes, would be appropriate.

E. Policy II.B.5k-Land adjacent to arterial streets. The single-family homes would be located between two busy roadways and rely upon one entry point.

F. Noise Goal. A new land use/noise conflict is likely to arise.

G. Policy II.C.4a-Noise considerations. The proposal does not address noise mitigation measures.

H. Transportation & Transit Goal. The proposed gated subdivision does not encourage bicycling, walking and transit use.

I. Policy II.D.4g-Pedestrian Opportunities. Pedestrian opportunities have not been included in this development and are not being promoted.

5. The proposal *further*s and *partially further*s the intent of the following Comprehensive Plan policies:

A. Policy II.B.5e-Programmed facilities/neighborhood integrity (*further*s). The use of existing services is unlikely to compromise neighborhood integrity.

B. Policy II.B.5l-Design quality/innovation (*partially further*s). The design is appropriate for the Plan area and some features add quality, but a “garagescape” design cannot be considered innovative.

6. With respect to the West Side Strategic Plan (WSSP), the proposal *does not further* the following policies:

A. WSSP Policy 4.10-The proposed site design hinders public mobility and discourages alternatives to single-occupancy vehicles.

B. WSSP Policy 4.6- the proposed site layout does not conform to the design policies with respect to Fences and Walls and Transit Access.

C. Design policies for residential development -The proposed subdivision does not provide wall openings so people can walk to transit stops.

D. WSSP Policy 2.5-There is nothing to prevent families with children from purchasing a home in the proposed subdivision. The high school and middle school are over capacity, and the elementary school is near capacity.

7. With respect to the WSSP, the proposal *further*s the following policies:

- A. WSSP Policy 1.1-The subject site is located north of the Paseo del Norte/Coors Community Center. It is appropriate that lower density (3-5 du/acre) residential development occur outside such centers.
 - B. WSSP Policy 3.8-Single-family uses are appropriate outside of Community and Neighborhood centers.
8. Regarding the Coors Corridor Sector Development Plan (CCSDP), the proposal *does not further* the following policies:
- A. Policy 4.b.10-Architectural Design. A large garage door dominates each design and monotonous perimeter walls do not enhance the visual environment.
 - B. Policy 4.b.4.B.1-Site Landscaping Regulation. Street trees are not proposed.
 - C. Policy 3.7-Cluster Design. The site layout is uniform and is not clustered in any way.
 - D. Policy 4.b.2-Building setback, height and bulk. The proposed development is gated and walled, so there is no functional relationship with the roadway or the surrounding community.
 - E. Policy 4.b.7-Access. Pedestrian and vehicular access is not separate, and no pedestrian connections from the cul-de-sacs are proposed.
 - F. Policy 3.5-Development Intensity. The proposed development is incompatible with roadway function and its intensity is incompatible with existing zoning.
9. The proposal *partially furthers* CCSDP Policy 4.a.3-New Development. The proposed design and colors are compatible with the surrounding built environment, but the landscape is sparse compared to nearby landscaping.
10. The following are instances of non-compliance with the 2001 design standards:
- A. A 6 ft. sidewalk shall connect Tract B and Tract C (the subject site). None is proposed.
 - B. The street trees along Irving Blvd. shall be located 25 ft. on center. None are proposed.
11. Gated subdivisions, which are “strongly discouraged on the West side” (WSSP p.169), do not relate to the surrounding community and restrict people’s access to nearby commercial areas and transit lines.

12. Mitigation of the garagescape feel can be achieved by increasing the proposed development's quality by providing additional landscaping, meeting minimum R-2 lot size requirements and not perpetuating gated subdivisions.

13. Poor access and internal circulation adversely affect bicyclists and pedestrians, and decrease the likelihood that residents will use Transit. The access point on Eagle Ranch Rd. caters to vehicles.

14. Nothing prevents families with children from purchasing a home in the proposed subdivision. Albuquerque Public Schools (APS) reports that schools in the area are at and nearing capacity.

15. The Street Tree Ordinance (Chapter 6, Article 6, R.O. 1974) requires that all applicants for building permits for new buildings (or additions over 200 sf) shall submit a street tree plan for the parts of the lot adjacent to a major street. No street trees are proposed.

16. A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was not required.

17. The New Vistas Home Owners Association (NVHOA) believes that the location is better suited to apartments or townhouses. However, the NVHOA would support improvements to the wall along Irving Blvd., street trees, pedestrian openings, and landscape and open space improvements.

RECOMMENDATION - 06EPC 01106, September 21, 2006

DENIAL of 06EPC 01106, a Site Development Plan for Building Permit for Tract C, Cottonwood Pointe, based on the preceding Findings.

***Catalina Lehner, AICP
Planner***

cc: Beazer Homes, 7007 Wyoming Blvd. NE, Suite F-5, Albuquerque, NM 87109
Tierra West LLC, 5571 Midway Park Pl. NE, Albuquerque, NM 87109

Larry Weaver, Paradise Hills Civic Assoc., 6001 Unitas Ct. NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114
Tom Anderson, Paradise Hills Civic Assoc., 1003 Plunkett Dr. NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114
Mike Newman, New Vistas Homeowners Association, 4219 Bryan Ave. NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114
Dean & Vera Butts, New Vistas Homeowners Association, 4207 Bryan Ave. NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114
Richard Hope, New Vistas Homeowners Association, 4115 New Vistas Ct. NW, Albuquerque, NM 87114

AGENCY COMMENTS

➤ **The following agencies did not review or comment on Project #1000771:**

City of Albuquerque

Environmental Health, Air Quality Division
Environmental Health, Env. Services Division
Fire Department, Planning
Parks & Recreation, Open Space Division
Parks & Recreation, Planning & Design

Other

Bernalillo County
Middle Rio Grande Conservancy Dist. (MRGCD)

➤ **The following City of Albuquerque Departments and Divisions reviewed and commented on Project #1000771:**

Planning, Zoning Code Services

Reviewed, no comment.

Planning, Office of Neighborhood Coordination

Paradise Hills Civic Assoc. ®
8/7/06 – Recommended for facilitation-siw
8/10/06 – Assigned to Philip Crump – sis

City Forrester

Shouldn't street trees be placed outside the wall along Irving and Eagle Ranch? Who would be responsible for them? – Why no trees along road inside subdivision when a continuous planting strip in there?

Parks & Recreation, Planning & Design

Reviewed, no objection. Request does not affect our facilities.

Police Department/Planning

Shawn McWethy Substation
On construction step up review needed at that time

Solid Waste Management Dept., Refuse Division

Approved on condition, will comply with all SWMD ordinances and requirements. (will have storage area for residential carts, not visible from street or located inside garage).

Transit Department

Adjacent and nearby routes	The #94 Unser Express passes the site on Eagle Ranch. The #96 Crosstown Commuter (peak hours and direction only), #156 West Side Rapid Ride (peak hours only), and #155 Coors (local all-day) pass within walking distance of the site on Coors. The #151 Rio Rancho-Albuquerque Rail Runner Connection also passes on Coors but stops only at Cottonwood Mall.
Adjacent bus stops	None. The #94 has stops adjacent to the neighboring apartment complex. The 96 and 155 have stops near Coors and Westside Dr, and both also share stops with the 156 in the vicinity of Coors and Irving.
Site plan requirements	Transit suggests providing pedestrian connections between the cul-de-sacs and Irving to facilitate pedestrian circulation.
Large site TDM suggestions	None.
Other information	None.

City of Albuquerque Public Works Department

Transportation Development (City Engineer/Planning Department):

- All the requirements of previous actions taken by the EPC and/or the DRB must be completed and /or provided for.
- The Developer is responsible for permanent improvements to the transportation facilities adjacent to the proposed site development plan for subdivision. Those improvements will include any additional right-of-way requirements, paving, curb and gutter, sidewalk and ADA accessible ramps that have not already been provided for. All public infrastructure constructed within public right-of-way or public easements shall be to City Standards. Those Standards will include but are not limited to sidewalks (std. dwg. 2430), driveways (std. dwg. 2425), private entrances (std. dwg. 2426) and wheel chair ramps (std. dwg. 2441).
- Has the site plan been through DRB Sketch Plan Review or have there been discussions with the Traffic Engineer? Internal Street design to be per DPM Standards or as approved previously by the Traffic Engineer.
- Site plan shall comply and be designed per DPM Standards.

Hydrology Development (City Engineer/Planning Department):

- An approved drainage report is required for site plan /preliminary plat approval by the City Engineer.
- Condition: Platting must be a concurrent DRB action.

Transportation Planning (Department of Municipal Development):

Findings

- To encourage pedestrian and bicycle travel between the proposed site and the many destinations along Irving Boulevard, a pedestrian and bicycle connection is needed linking this proposed development to Irving Boulevard.

Conditions

- Construct a *minimum* 8 foot wide paved pedestrian and bicycle pathway (to ADA standards; with bollards at the Irving connection) linking this development to Irving Boulevard.

Traffic Engineering Operations (Department of Municipal Development):

- No comments received.

Street Maintenance (Department of Municipal Development):

- No comments received.

Utility Development (Water Authority):

- No comments received.

Water Resources, Water Utilities and Wastewater Utilities (Water Authority):

- No comments received.

New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT):

- No comments received.

**RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS FROM CITY ENGINEER, MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT,
WATER AUTHORITY and NMDOT:**

Conditions of approval for the proposed Site Development Plan for Subdivision and Site Development Plan for Building Permit shall include:

- a. All the requirements of previous actions taken by the EPC and/or the DRB must be completed and /or provided for.
- b. The Developer is responsible for permanent improvements to the transportation facilities adjacent to the proposed site development plan for subdivision. Those improvements will include any additional right-of-way requirements, paving, curb and gutter, sidewalk and ADA accessible ramps that have not already been provided for. All public infrastructure constructed within public right-of-way or public easements shall be to City Standards. Those Standards will include but are not limited to sidewalks (std. dwg. 2430), driveways (std. dwg. 2425), private entrances (std. dwg. 2426) and wheel chair ramps (std. dwg. 2441).
- c. Site plan shall comply and be designed per DPM Standards.
- d. Platting must be a concurrent DRB action.
- e. Construct a *minimum* 8 foot wide paved pedestrian and bicycle pathway (to ADA standards; with bollards at the Irving connection) linking this development to Irving Boulevard.

➤ **The following agencies reviewed and commented on Project #1000771:**

Albuquerque Public Schools (APS)

Cottonwood Pointe is a proposed residential subdivision consisting of 50 single-family units located on Eagle Ranch Rd NW between Irving Blvd NW and the Calabacillas Arroyo. The proposed development will impact Petroglyph Elementary School, James Monroe Middle School, and Cibola High School. **Currently, James Monroe Middle School and Cibola High School are exceeding capacity. Petroglyph Elementary School will be nearing capacity as development continues in the area.**

School	2006-07 Projections	2006-07 Capacity	Space Available
Petroglyph	815	850	35
James Monroe	1,520	1,274	-246
Cibola	3,071	2,300	-771

A new northwest high school will open with a 9th grade academy in 2007, while the remainder of the school will open in 2008. The new northwest high school will relieve overcrowding at Cibola High School.

To address overcrowding at schools, APS will explore various alternatives. A combination or all of the following options may be utilized to relieve overcrowded schools.

- Provide new capacity (long term solution)
 - Construct new schools or additions
 - Add portables
 - Use of non-classroom spaces for temporary classrooms
 - Lease facilities
 - Use other public facilities
- Improve facility efficiency (short term solution)
 - Schedule Changes
 - Double sessions
 - Multi-track year-round
 - Other
 - Float teachers (flex schedule)
- Shift students to Schools with Capacity (short term solution)
 - Boundary Adjustments / Busing
 - Grade reconfiguration
- Combination of above strategies

All planned additions to existing educational facilities are contingent upon taxpayer approval.

Abq. Metro Arroyo Flood Control Authority (AMAFCA)

Reviewed, no comment.

Mid-Region Council of Governments (MRCOG)

Eagle Ranch Rd is designated a Collector Facility on the Long Range Roadway System with a right-of-way of 86 feet. In addition Eagle Ranch Rd is designated as having on-street bicycle lanes in the Long Range Bikeway System. Please coordinate with DMD to insure project conformity with these policies of the Metropolitan Transportation Board.

Public Service Company of New Mexico

No comment based on the information provided to date. It is the applicant's obligation to determine if utility easements cross the property and to abide by any conditions or terms of those easements.